DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 759 HE 016 746

AUTHOR Nichols, Irene A.; Golden, M. Patricia
TITLE The Middle Way: Patron as Guide.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for the Interdisciplinary Study of Education, 500 HO, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); Advocacy; *Career Ladders; *College Faculty; Consultants; Employment Level; Faculty Promotion; Females; Helping Relationship; Higher Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Mentors; *Minority Groups; Power Structure; *Women Faculty

ABSTRACT

A model of a patron system is presented that distinguishes among the kinds of power academic patrons have (formal or informal), as well as their professional orientation (cosmopolitan or local). It is argued that if some form of patron system is necessary to assure the success of minority persons and women in academia, it need not be the traditional one based on the patron as guru or gatekeeper, both patron-protege relationships characterized by deference, obligation, exclusivity, and exclusion. Academic patronage is also considered in regard to professional or organizational authority and professional or organizational influence. It is maintained that a particular kind of patron system, patron-as-guide, may be most appropriate for furthering the careers of minorities and women. Attention is directed to how the patron-as-guide, using informal power in local contexts, might help minority persons and women move effectively through formal bureaucratic structures. Two examples of how academics may serve as guides to foster colleagues' career development are considered: faculty as consultants and faculty as advocates. Finally, some theoretical implications and practical consequences of the patron-as-guide relationship for the careers of minorities and women are discussed. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235759

THE MIDDLE WAY: PATRON AS GUIDE

Irene A. Nichols
Foundations of Education Department
College of Human Development Professions

M. Patricia Golden
Sociology/Anthropology Department
College of Arts and Sciences

Northeastern University

HE016746

Paper presented as a part of a symposium, The Academic Mentor: Guru, Gatekeeper, or Guide, at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982. Copies of the paper are available from Irene A. Nichols, Associate Professor of Education, Institute for the Interdisciplinary Study of Education, 500 HO, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Patricia Golden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"Making it" in academia requires more than competence. In universities, as in other organizations, success depends not only on how good you are but also on how good others think you are (Caplow and McGee, 1958; Kundsin, 1974).[1] Those who make it into the ranks of the elite in academia--i.e., tenured professorships at prestigious universities--have traditionally had the advantage not only of special benefits (Epstein, 1974) but also of powerful patrons. According to Levinson (1978:98), patrons may serve as teachers "to facilitate...entry and advancement," as hosts or guides, "to welcome initiates into a new occupation or social world" and "to acquaint them with its values, customs, and cast of characters" or as exemplars "to admire and emulate." Conversely, patrons may serve as gatekeepers (Collins, 1982) who function as much to inhibit the entry of less desirable proteges as to facilitate the advancement of more favored ones.

Following Lorber (1975), Shapiro, Hazeltine, and Rowe (1978:54) describe a system of professional patronage which includes a set of advisory/guiding persons who function "as patrons--protectors, benefactors, sponsors, champions, advocates, supporters, and advisors." They use the term mentor in a restricted sense only to characterize the most intense and paternalistic type of patron.

> (P)atron relationships that fall toward the mentor end of the continuum tend to be more hierarchical and parental, more intense and exclusionary and therefore ...more elitist.

1.Whyte (1956:184) puts it succinctly: "...the way to success in organization life depends on being aware that most of the decisions that affect one's destiny are made by others..."

These are the gurus mentioned by Levinson (1978) and Carter (1982), the godfathers or rabbis described by Kanter (1977). The term peer pals (Davidson, as cited by Shapiro, et al., 1978:55) is used to describe the relationship between colleagues helping each other to succeed and progress. A reciprocal relationship is implied--

> ...through sharing information and strategies and providing sounding boards and advice for one another - peer pals help each other while helping themselves (Shapiro, et al., 1978:56).

Sponsors have a more hierarchical relationship with their proteges. They are strong patrons, especially in a local context, but less powerful than mentors in promoting and shaping the careers of their proteges (Shapiro, et al., 1978:55). Finally, guides are characterized as being less able than mentors and sponsors to fulfill the roles of benefactor, protector, or champion to their proteges, but as invaluable in explaining the system. Their primary functions are "to point out the pitfalls to be avoided and shortcuts to be pursued, and generally to provide valuable intelligence to their proteges." Because guides have less power, their relationships tend to be "more egalitarian and peer related, less intense and exclusionary, and, therefore, potentially more democratic by allowing access to a larger number of young professionals (Shapiro, et al., 1978:56)."

In this paper we develop a model of the patron system which differentiates among its varied functions in terms of the kind of power academic patrons have (formal or informal) and the kind of professional orientation they have (cosmopolitan or local). We argue that, if some form of patron system is necessary to assure the success of minority persons and women in academia

(Shapiro, et al., 1978), it need not be the traditional one based on the patron as guru (Levinson, 1978; Carter, 1982) or gatekeeper (Riesman, 1956; Epstein, 1974; Collins, 1982)--patron-protege relationships characterized by deference, obligation, exclusivity, and exclusion. Rather, we maintain that, in the current circumstances, a particular kind of patron system, patron-as-guide, may be most appropriate for furthering the careers of minority persons and women. We then attempt to show how the patron-as-guide, using informal power in local contexts, might help minority persons and women to move effectively through formal bureaucratic structures. Finally, we discuss some theoretical implications and practical consequences of the patron-as-guide relationship for the careers of minority persons and women.

Power in Bureaucratic Organizations: Formal and Informal

Universities, like other bureaucracies, have certain typical structural features (Weber, 1947:329-330). As summarized by Merton (1940:561), these include: 1) /an/ integrated...series of offices, of hierarchized statuses;... 2) authority, the power of control which...inheres in the office and not in the particular person who performs the official role; and 3) a considerable degree of formality and clearly defined social distances between the occupants of these positions. Bureaucracies have, as well, an informal structure that is not recognized or understood by the uninitiated. Like the formal, the informal structure consists of "rules, groupings, and sanctioned systems of procedures (Page, 1946-1947:90)." These are just as real as those of the formal structure, although they are not officially recognized.

In universities as elsewhere, the informal structure provides a "channel of circumvention" of the formally prescribed rules and methods of procedure.

Because the features of bureaucracy's other "face" are not readily apparent to the uninitiated, successful participation in the system must be gained through experience in the group itself. The speed with which one learns the ropes depends on a number of factors, including one's role as defined by other "inmates" (Page, 1946-1947:90).

Power within organizations, including universities, can be exercised both formally and informally through authoritative orders or influential suggestions (Hage and Aiken, 1970:21-22). The formal exercise of power is called authority (Merton, 1940) and inheres in the office. Informal power derives from one's personal attributes, from one's ability to persuade, and is often referred to as influence (Argyris, 1964; Hage and Aiken, 1970). The social organization of universities, of course, is not identical with other bureaucracies such as the military or business (Caplow and McGee, 1958). The basic difference and the source of conflict between bureaucracies and professions is in the area of authority relationships. Administrative, or executive, authority permeates bureaucracies (Etzioni, 1964:76; Pavalko, 1971:189), whereas professional authority is supposedly based on "the demonstration of superior competence" ...legitimized by "colleague authority which demands autonomy for the individual practitioner and makes him responsible for his decisions and actions (Pavalko, 1971:189)." Scott (1966) indicates four main areas of conflict: the professional's resistance to bureaucratic rules; the professional's rejection of bureaucratic standards; the professional's resistance to bureaucratic super-

vision, and the professional's conditional loyalty to the bureaucracy.

Professionals in Bureaucracies: Cosmopolitans and Locals

Professionals in bureaucratic organizations face a special set of challenges and conflicts (Pavalko, 1971; Blau, 1964; Etzioni, 1961, 1964). Professionals emphasize autonomy (Moore, 1970; Clark, 1963); bureaucrats demand adherence to organizational rules, regulations, and procedures (Weber, 1947; Merton, 1940). The professional and bureaucratic organization of work also differs in important ways (Fichter, 1961). Bureaucratic leadership is centralized and depends upon someone occupying a formally defined leadership position. Leadership in the professions requires competence and expertise (See Moore, 1970; Vollmer and Mills, 1960). Bureaucratic responsibility, interpersonal relations, and service and loyalty to the organization contrast with the kind of individual responsibility, relations with colleagues, service to the client and loyalty to the colleague group which are considered characteristic of professions.

Several writers have examined the tension between bureaucratic and professional demands in different kinds of organizations (Riesman, 1949; Wilensky, 1959; Blau and Scott, 1962; Corwin, 1961). In his landmark study, Gouldner (1957, 1958) explored the professional commitment and organizational loyalty of faculty members at a small liberal arts college. He concluded that "there seems to be some tension between an organization's bureaucratic needs for expertise, and its social-system needs for loyalty (Gouldner, 1958)." Drawing on Merton's (1940) typology of community leaders, Gouldner distinguished two types of role orientations among faculty: the cosmopolitan, characterized by low loyalty to the organization, high commitment to specialized

role skills, and an orientation toward an outside reference group representing a professional specialty; and the local, characterized by high loyalty to the organization, low commitment to specialized role skills, and an orientation toward a reference group representing an organizational location.

The Patron System in Academia: A Typology

To understand the functions of patrons in academia and to analyze their effectiveness for furthering the careers of minority persons and women, a typology may be helpful (see Figure 1). Using the dichotomies of power (authority or influence) and faculty orientation (professional or organizational), we can specify four types of academic patronage:

Professional Authority

Such patrons derive their authority from their formal offices. Their cosmopolitan orientation and their acknowledged status in their disciplines is critical in their patron relationships. They are, in many ways, beyond the organization. Their charisma, eminence, independence and (presumed) mobility make them immune to organizational pressures and constraints. These are the gurus or priests of Carter (1982), the rabbis or godfathers of Kanter (1977), the exemplars of Levinson (1977), the mentors, in the restricted sense used by Shapiro, et al. (1978)--influential persons able, when they choose, to circumvent the formal structures. As Friedson (1968) points out, professional authority is at its highest when the number of those who hold it is small in relation to demand. Patrons with professional authority are limited in number and, because of their prestige, concentrated in certain select institutions. They

Figure 1

Patrons in Academia: A Typology

POWER OF CONTROL	FACULTY ORIENTATION	
	PROFESSIONAL (Cosmopolitan)	ORGANIZATIONAL (Local)
AUTHORITY (Formal)	PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY	ORGANIZATIONAL AUTHORITY
	1. Guru (Carter, 1982;	1. Sponsor (Shapiro, et al.,1978)
	2. Mentor (Shapiro, et al., 1978)	2. Gatekeeper (Collins, 1982; Epstein, 1974; Reisman, 1956)
	3. Godfather, Rabbi, or Priest (Kantor, 1977)	
	4. Exemplar (Levinson, 1978; Schmidt and Wolfe, 1980)	
INFLUENCE (Informal)	PROFESSIONAL INFLUENCE	ORGANIZATIONAL INFLUENCE
	1. Networking (Kaufman, 1982)	1. Guide, or Host (Nichols and Golden, 1982; Levinson, 1978; Shapiro, et al., 1978)
	2. Peer Pals (Shapiro, et al., 1978)	2. Consultant, Interpreter, Advisor (Nichols and Golden, 1982; Schmidt and Wolfe, 1980)
	3. Colleagues (Carter, 1982; Collins, 1982)	3. Advocate (Nichols and Golden, 1982)

are accessible to, and probably willing to take on, very few proteges.

Organizational Authority

Academic patronage based on one's office and on one's knowledge of, and loyalty to, the organization can be very effective. These might be the sponsors referred to by Shapiro, et al. (1978); or, the gatekeepers of whom Collins (1982) speaks. In fact, especially locally within a given institution, such patrons might even be able to advance--or end--careers by fiat (e.g., a dean or a provost who overrules a negative decision of a tenure committee; or, alternatively, a dean or president who unilaterally declares, "No new positions in department X of college Y").

Professional Influence

Professional influence is informal and confined to one's discipline. It is based on a faculty member's network of colleagues and peer pals (Shapiro , et al., 1978) and provides mutual support among those of more or less equivalent status (Kaufman, 1982).

Organizational Influence

Organizational influence derives from informal power and specialized knowledge of a local university or department. Those with organizational influence are the hosts or guides mentioned by Levinson (1978) and Shapiro, et al., (1978), the consultants or advisors refered to by Schmidt and Wolfe (1980). They are people who can put their unique knowledge of politics and procedures to work on behalf of junior professionals in their own institutions.

The Middle Way: Patron-as-Guide

Though there is evidence that professional authority works (Levinson, 1978; Kanter, 1977), there is also evidence that it works only for select groups and only at select types of institutions (Broad, 1982). Access to professional authority is not governed by democratic or egalitarian principles (Shapiro, et al., 1978). Furthermore, even if access is gained, the relationship has drawbacks:

> Most often...an intense mentor relationship ends with strong conflict and bad feelings on both sides. The young man may have powerful feelings of bitterness, rancor, grief, abandonment, liveration, and rejuvenation...the mentor, for his part, finds the young man inexplicably touchy, unreceptive to even the best counsel, irrationally rebellious and ungrateful. By the time they are through, there is generally some validity in each one's criticism of the other (Levinson, 1978:100-110).

It is difficult in such a relationship to move from the role of subordinate to that of peer.

Mentors can inhibit independence and professional autonomy. And the evidence indicates that even more than others, minority persons and women are expected, in their patron relationships, to remain subordinate (e.g., the research associate syndrome) and dependent (Hall, 1969; Epstein, 1974; Reskin, 1979; Collins, 1982). Notwithstanding these negative features, it could be argued that the best solution for minority persons and women would be to have large numbers of academics with professional authority who would be willing to use their clout to advance the careers of minority persons and women. If entree to the academy could, practically, be accomplished in this way, one might

compromise, individually and collectively, on such issues as dependence and obligation, in order to achieve professional enfranchisement (Golden, Nichols and Carter, 1981)--presuming it is possible to achieve true "enfranchisement" in this way. Likewise, if there were sufficient numbers of academics with organizational authority, and if their gatekeeper tendencies could be overcome, sponsors could be put to work on behalf of minority and women faculty. The record at most institutions is not encouraging, however. Minority and women academics have higher unemployment rates, lower salaries, lower academic ranks and lower rates of promotion and tenure than majority males with similar qualifications (AAAS, 1978). Realistically speaking, for minority persons certainly, and probably for women too (especially in some fields), the viability of a patron system based on professional or organizational authority is limited. There are not enough gurus or sponsors to go around. If we have to wait for academics with formal authority to foster the entry and advancement of young professionals, then there are many fields in which we may never have minority or women faculty.

Given present circumstances, we believe that the effective use of organizational influence is the best strategy available for accomplishing the inclusion of minority persons and women in academia. As Page (1946-1947) notes, each organization

> has its own <u>internal</u> traditions, its own caucuses, cliques, and pressure groups, its own status systems and compelling values, its own routines and "grape-vine" procedures, which are the inmate's very own and which are hidden to the outsider and the fresh newcomer.

This may be local information, but it is important information. Guides have organizational influence and can help one to learn the ropes, the unwritten

rules and expectations. They can tell you where to look, how to look, who to ask, and when to do what (Schmidt and Wolfe, 1980:47). They do not seek dependency, but offer support. They are often anonymous. At the same time, it is not an exclusive process. The guide can work with one person or with several. Likewise, an individual can have more than one guide. Harlan and Weiss (1980:34) and Mokros, et al., (1981:13), for example, cite multiple helping relationships as being characteristic of the mentoring experience of women. They suggest that having multiple patrons may be an adaptive alternative in that one's fate is not dependent on the professional progress of a sole patron.

A further advantage is that potential guides are everywhere. They do not have to be in the same field. In fact, the guide need not be a professional. "In this respect, secretaries and administrative assistants are often overlooked as potential and actual patrons for young professionals (Shapiro, et al., 1978:55)."

It can be argued, as our colleague, Carter (1982) has, that guides are not very powerful people and that minority persons and women need access to power. We contend, however, that sufficient numbers of advocates with formal power are just not available now, nor will they be in the foreseeable future. Guides may not have formal power, but they can have influence. Informal power is, nonetheless, power. Guides may not be able to get you there, but they can show you the way. They may not be able to make you a star, but they can tell you what you need to do to become one.[2] They cannot give you formal power,

---

2.See Broad (1982:478). Here it is clearly shown how a powerful mentor, with

but they can outline for you the steps necessary to achieve it (whom to cultivate, what meetings to attend, what committees to serve on, etc.).

How important professional authority might be in "making it" in academica depends in part on how one defines success. If by success we mean that minority persons and women are employed, tenured, and promoted at elite institutions, then clearly the strategy we propose will never work. That is just not the way those institutions operate. If, on the other hand, we define success more broadly to include not only increasing the number of minority persons and women at elite institutions, but also employing, retaining, tenuring and promoting minority persons and women in the whole range of institutions in which they work, the patron as guide presents the best--in most cases, the only viable--alternative for furthering the career development of minority persons and women. Specific examples of how, in the absence of gurus or sponsors, academics may serve as guides to foster the career development of colleagues may prove helpful. From our experience, we provide two.

Faculty Consultants

Our concern with the issues which are the subject of this paper grew out of our involvement as staff in a postdoctoral faculty fellowship program at Northeastern University. Our project was funded by a grant from the National Institute of Education and our proposal was written in response to a grant announcement which stressed, among other things, the importance of mentoring to the postdoctoral experience. We incorporated the term into our proposal and attempted to build patron-protege relationships into our program. From the

---

professional authority, can make a young colleague a star.

first, though, staff and fellows alike felt uncomfortable with the forced nature of the relationship and with the hierarchical and dependent statuses it implied. We searched for a more humane way to provide fellows with what they needed--e.g., resources and access to colleagues--and for a better word to describe the types of relationships we hoped for. After much discussion, we settled on the term consultant. We sought a relationship which would give fellows maximum flexibility, information, and independence--a situation in which involved faculty would be available and accessible on a more cooperative and collegial basis, and without the condition or the expectation of reciprocity. To give fellows a sense of efficacy, they would, as one does when selecting a consultant, determine the nature of the relationship and, within the constraints of faculty time, the degree of involvement of the faculty consultant. Though we probably did not always succeed, our goal was a helpful and supportive relationship based on cooperation and mutual respect.

Faculty Advocate

We have also had experience with the patron-as-guide in the tenure and promotion process in the College of Arts and Sciences at our University. To prepare for tenure consideration, probationary faculty choose or are assigned a faculty advocate, a senior member, usually from the same department, who is familiar with the review process and aware of the kinds of materials and documentation that are necessary to prepare an effective tenure case. The advocate works with the junior professional to prepare the dossier, to solicit letters from external references, to monitor the work of review committees (department and college), and, generally, to offer support and keep the candidate informed about the process and possible outcomes. In what is usually a very tense

period, a colleague who knows the way serves as advisor, consultant, advocate, friend, sharing the burden, translating, interpreting, showing the way--in other words, a patron-as-guide.

Conclusions

Roles in academic institutions can be structured to promote the success of minority persons and women. The patron-as-guide can help the novice learn the ropes and find a way through the sometimes treacherous academic terrain. We agree that patrons, no matter how benign or egalitarian, should not be necessary. Universities should be collegial organizations. Recognition should be based on what you do, your record, not on who you are, what you are, or who you know. Over twenty years ago, Riesman (1956) talked about the increasing democratization of the university. Though we have, indeed, come a long way, we still have a long way to go. The statistics on women and minorities in higher education, especially in top level positions, are dismal and need not be reiterated here (see AAAS, 1978; Vetter and Babco, 1980). Affirmative action has only slightly ameliorated the situation. Even when minority persons and women are enfranchised, they may still have difficulties developing a sense of their own efficacy, that is, a feeling that they can make a difference (Golden, Nichols, and Carter, 1981).

Universities and other academic institutions have remained recalcitrant and unwilling to change the bureaucratic structures to accomodate and encourage participation by minority persons and women. We see no realistic alternative other than to bore from within. Greater numbers of qualified

faculty, minority and majority, must take on the role of patron-as-guide, if we are to change the academic bureaucracy from a system of "participatory autocracy," fed by the paternalistic tradition of patron-protege relationships, to a system of true collegiality nurtured by a more egalitarian view of patron-as-guide.

References

AAAS News
1978 "New Data Show Uneven Progress for Women and Minorities." Science, 3.

Argyris, Chris
1964 "The Process of Influence and Manipulation Within the Organizational Setting." Industrial Medicine and Surgery, 33 (December).

Blackburn, Robert T.
1981 "Cloning in Academe: Mentorship and Academic Careers." Research in Higher Education, 15, No. 4:315-327.

Blau, Peter M.
1967 Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Blau, Peter M. and Richard W. Scott
1962 Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.

Broad, William J.
1982 "Harvard Delays in Reporting Fraud." Science, 215 (January):478-482.

Caplow, Theodore and Reece J. McGee
1958 The Academic Marketplace. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.

Carter, Holly M.
1982 "Making It in Academia: Gurus Can Get You There?" Paper presented as part of a symposium on The Academic Mentor at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, March 19-23.

Clark, Burton R.
1963 "Faculty Organization and Authority." Pp. 37-51 in Terry F. Lunsford (ed.), The Study of Academic Administration. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Collins, Roger L.
1982 "Colonialism on Campus: A Critique of Mentoring to Achieve Equity in Higher Education." Paper presented as part of a symposium on The Academic Mentor at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, March 19-3.

Corwin, Ronald G.
1961 "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles." American Journal of Sociology, 66 (May):604-615.

Epstein, Cynthia F.
1974 "Bringing Women In: Rewards, Punishment, and the Structure of Achievement." Pp. 13-21 in R. B. Kundsin (ed.), Women and Success: The Anatomy of Achievement. New York: William Morrow and Co.

Epstein, Cynthia F.
1971 Woman's Place. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Epstein, Cynthia F.
1970 "Encountering the Male Establishment: Sex-Status Limits on Women's Careers in the Professions." American Journal of Sociology, 75:965-982.

Etzioni, Amitai
1964 Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Etzioni, Amitai
1961 Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press.

Fichter, Joseph H.
1961 Religion as an Occupation. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Freidson, Eliot
1968 "The Impurity of Professional Authority." In Howard S. Becker et al. (eds.), Institutions and the Person: Papers Presented to Everett C. Hughes. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Golden, M. Patricia, Irene A. Nichols and Holly M. Carter
1981 "Affirmative Actions: Designing Educational Policies to Influence Educational Research." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August, 21-24.

Gouldner, Alvin W.
1958 "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, No. 2 (March): 444-480.

Hage, Jerald and Michael Aiken
1970 Social Change in Complex Organizations. New York: Random House.

Hall, Richard H.
1969 Occupations and the Social Structure. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Harlan A. and C. Weiss
1980 Sex Differences in Factors Affecting Managerial Career Advancement. Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Working Paper No. 56.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss
1977 Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Kaufman, Debra R.
1981 "Women in Science: Reappraising Explanations for Their Representation and Performance." Paper presented to the Interdisciplinary International Congress on Women, Haifa, Israel, December 26.

Kundsin, R. B. (Editor)
1974 Women and Success: The Anatomy of Achievement. New York: William Morrow and Co.

Lee, Susan, Debra Gilbert and Solomon Cytrynbaum
1981 "Mentoring and the Young Professional Women in Academia." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17.

Levinson, D. J., C. N. Darrow, E. B. Klein, M. H. Levinson and B. McKee
1978 The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Lorber, Judith
1975 "Professional Patronage and Sponsorship in Medicine." In Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter (eds.), Another Voice. New York: Anchor Books.

Merton, Robert K.
1940 "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." Social Forces, 18: 561-568.

Mokros, Janice R., Sumni Erkut and Lynne Spichiger
1981 Mentoring and Being Mentored: Sex-Related Patterns Among College Professors. Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Working Paper No. 68.

Moore, Kathryn M.
1982 "The Role of Mentors in Developing Leaders for Academe." Educational Record, 63, No. 1:22-28.

Moore, Wilbert E.
1970 The Professions: Roles and Rules. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Page, Charles H.
1946-1947 "Bureaucracy's Other Face." Social Forces, 25:88-94.

Pavalko, Ronald M.
1971 Sociology of Occupations and Professions. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Reskin, Barbara F.
1979 "Academic Sponsorship and Scientists' Careers." Sociology of Education, 52:129-140.

Riesman, David
1956 Constraint and Variety in American Education. Omaha, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Schmidt, Janet A. and Janice Wolfe Sutera
1980 "The Mentor Partnership: Discovery of Professionalism." NASPA Journal, 17 (Winter).

Scott, Richard W.
1966 "Professionals in Bureaucracies--Areas of Conflict." Pp. 265-275 in Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills (ed.), Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Shapiro, Eileen C., Florence P Haseltine and Mary P. Rowe
1978 "Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors and the 'Patron System.'" Sloan Management Review, 10, No. 3 (Spring).

Speizer, Jeanne
1981 "Review Essay: Role Models, Mentors, and Sponsors; the Elusive Concepts." Signs, 6, No. 4:692-712.

Stein, Sandra L.
1981 "Faculty Expectations of Doctoral and Career Mentors." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, PA, March.

Stein, Sandra L.
1981 "Sex Differences in the Expectations of Mentors." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17.

Vetter, Betty M. and Eleanor L. Babco
1975 Professional Women and Minorities: A Manpower Data Resource Service. Washington, DC: Scientific Manpower Commission.

Vollmer, Howard M. and Donald L. Mills (Editors)
1966 Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Watkins, Bari
1980 "Training Educational Opportunity Researchers: Some Sobering Thoughts on Mentoring, Some Optimistic Thoughts on Community." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA, April.

Weber, Max
1947 The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. A. Henderson and T. Parsons (trs.), Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Whyte, William
1956 The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Wilensky, Harold L.
1959 Intellectuals in Labour Unions. New York: The Free Press.

Wrightsman, Lawrence
1981 "Research Methodologies for Assessing Mentoring." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.